7.2.12

13 April 1956 Friday Shamley Green

My dear Dorothy,

I visit the office on Wednesdays and the day before yesterday I found there your two long letters, parts one and two as it were, written on 31 March. Fine letters. Here are some attempted replies to your points.

The grey schedule, on which you comment, is intended to be used by doctors who are consulted by people who want guidance on a eugenic question. The people concerned are worried about a skeleton in the family background. This is what they want to talk about. The useful part of the schedule is to have the family tree prepared for you, with the people designated. What I then do is to go through the pedigree with the people concerned adding my own notes. In these a record is duly made of all possible offsetting (favourable) features. But the patients (Or propositi or clients, whatever you call them) often make notes about these features themselves. I have never known anyone object to the schedule, which saves a vast amount of time and serves the useful purpose of making the patient take in the pedigree as a whole.

Your article on eugenics. I can add nothing to what I have already written in books which are in your possession. I refer to the book on Galton (particularly pp. 283 - 317) and the avoirdupois book World Population and Resources especially pp. 288 - 292. Osborn's book Preface to Eugenics should also provide an abundance of vigorous stimulus. Much more than my books. His idea of (what I call) crypto-eugenics is, I am sure, sound for the USA. You seek to fulfill the aims of eugenics without disclosing what you are really aiming at and without mentioning the word. You will find something about this in the next (April) issue of our Eugenics Review which has been badly held up by the printer's strike.

Margaret Sanger told me in the most explicit manner that she had several times been put in gaol. She said so before we controlled the microphone in a broadcast in Bombay in which she, Lady R.R., Mrs. Watumull, Vogt and I took part. In introducing her (I was as it were chairman of the symposium) I stressed that she had been in prison several times. So blame her, not me!

Cant you really continue to edit the bulletin? I am sure that, on the balance of swings and roundabouts, you gain more than you lose by doing it. Need the duties (very good for you to have some) interfere with your spending the winters in a warm place? But if you really intend to put up the sign in January, some alternative arrangement must be made. It would not be in the least easy to do the job here in London. So far as I am concerned, I give all the time I can spare to the Eugenics Society and the IPPF as it is.